

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air a commercial-free anti-Kerry documentary days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media consolidation.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for their bottom line instead of the balanced information needed to create and nurture an informed electorate, which is the foundation of a true democracy.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard.

Why isn't there a law that protects affiliate stations so that they're not required to pre-empt scheduled programming with programs dictated by the owner corporation unless the information is vital to protect public security or safety?

Also, media conglomerates should be given two options regarding broadcasting of a political nature (whether it's news, commercials, or documentaries about presidential candidates)- they should either be required to allot equal time to different viewpoints (w/ failure to do so resulting in severe penalty) OR state upfront that they do not make this a practice and state what specific political agenda they intend to exclusively promote.

Thank you.